



Sustainable Transport Strategy 2006 – 2016

Islington's Local Implementation Plan

Appendix S: Meeting the LIP Guidance

Appendix S

Meeting the LIP Guidance

Appendix contents

INTRODUCTION.....	4
ISLINGTON COUNCIL’S STS CHAPTER STRUCTURE.....	4
COMPARISON OF LIP GUIDANCE STRUCTURE TO STS STRUCTURE	4
OTHER STS CHAPTERS AND APPENDICES.....	5
LIP REPORTING AND FUNDING (LIP R&F) TRANSPORT PROGRAMMES..	6
CONCLUSION	8
ANNEX: ISLINGTON COUNCIL’S RESPONSES TO TFL’S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION DRAFT	9

List of tables

TABLE S.1: LIP GUIDANCE SUGGESTED STRUCTURE MAPPED TO ISLINGTON’S STS STRUCTURE	5
TABLE S.2: OTHER STS CHAPTERS AND APPENDICES.....	5
TABLE S.3: LIP REPORTING AND FUNDING (LIP R&F) TRANSPORT PROGRAMMES	6

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this appendix is to provide Transport for London (TfL) with a ‘map’ of Islington’s Sustainable Transport Strategy (STS) to assist them in finding all the information that has been required for inclusion in boroughs’ Local Implementation Plans. In addition, a council response to each Mayor’s Transport Strategy policy and proposal is provided in the annex.

2.0 Islington Council’s STS chapter structure

- 2.1 In their guidance on the development of Local Implementation Plans, Transport for London strongly encouraged boroughs to follow their suggested chapter structure. However, in developing this Sustainable Transport Strategy, Islington Council has chosen to go beyond the minimum LIP requirement in order to produce a strategy that will act as a useful planning tool in the years to come. This has required some minor shifting of TfL’s suggested structure. All required content is provided, but the order of chapters and the grouping of content has been chosen to fit logically with how the council will implement the strategy.
- 2.2 Although we have moved some suggested chapters to our list of appendices, it should be noted that there is no difference in importance or status between chapters and appendices. Both represent essential parts of the strategy.
- 2.3 Below we have provided a chapter-by-chapter explanation of why we have chosen to structure our LIP as outlined above. We then list each LIP Guidance chapter to show where it will be covered in our proposed structure.

Comparison of LIP Guidance structure to STS structure

- 2.4 Table S.1 compares the LIP Guidance suggested chapter structure to the structure of Islington’s STS.

Table S.1: LIP Guidance suggested structure mapped to Islington's STS structure

LIP Guidance chapter	Where found in Islington's STS
1. Local Socio-Economic / Demographic Context	STS Chapter 1
2. Local Transport Context	STS Chapter 2
3. Borough Policy Statement	STS Chapter 3
4. Equality Impact Assessment	STS Appendix K
5. LIP Proposals for MTS priority areas, targets and Appendix C	Proposals in STS Chapter 4; delivery programme summary in STS Chapter 5 along with funding implications; detailed ten-year programme of schemes in Sustainable Transport Strategy Appendix A
6. Road Safety Plan	STS Appendix C
7. Parking and Enforcement Plan	STS Appendix E
8. School Travel Plan Strategy	STS Appendix D
9. Performance Measures	STS Chapter 7
10. Consultation Results	STS Appendices P-S
11. Borough core capacity statement	STS Chapter 6
12. Funding Implications	STS Chapter 5, along with summary of borough-wide delivery plan

3.0 Other STS chapters and appendices

In addition to the requirements of the LIP Guidance, a number of other chapters and appendices have been included in Islington's Sustainable Transport Strategy. These are described in table S.2.

Table S.2: Other STS chapters and appendices

STS chapter / appendix	Brief description
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 8: Transport Implications of the A1 Borough Strategy • Chapter 9: Regeneration and major public transport projects 	outlining the transport implications of the A1 Borough Strategy, and other regeneration and major transport projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 10: North Area Transport Action Plan • Chapter 11: East Area Transport Action Plan • Chapter 12: South Area Transport Action Plan • Chapter 13: West Area Transport Action Plan 	summary of all proposals and programmes affecting each geographical area of the borough (to be produced for approved LIP)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B: LIP Proposal Delivery Forms 	required LIP forms for each proposal area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix F: Islington Walking and Accessibility Action Plan 	brings together all policies and proposals affecting walking and accessibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix G: Islington Cycling Action Plan 	brings together all policies and proposals affecting cycling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix H: Motorcycle and Scooter Action Plan 	brings together all policies and proposals affecting motorcycles and scooters
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix I: Air travel policy statement 	Brings together all policies related to air travel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix J: Draft SEA Statement 	summarises how the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process has influenced the final draft STS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix M: Legal framework to local implementation plan development 	the legal framework within which Islington’s LIP has been developed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix N: Partnerships and common statements 	collation of all common statements for the partnerships in which Islington is involved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix O: Transport duties and responsibilities in Islington 	lay-person’s guide to who is responsible for the various aspects of the transport network in Islington
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix S: Meeting the LIP Guidance 	‘map’ of the structure of Islington’s STS, and how TfL’s consultation response has been addressed

4.0 LIP Reporting and Funding (LIP R&F) transport programmes

4.1 Islington Council has in some cases used slightly different terminology from TfL’s LIP R&F guidance. Table S.3 shows where information on each LIP R&F programme area can be found in Islington’s STS.

Table S.3: LIP Reporting and Funding (LIP R&F) transport programmes

LIP R&F transport programme	STS proposal(s)	Appendix A table	Form 1 reference(s)
Routes and corridors			
Principal Road Renewal (RO)	HI1	Highways infrastructure (HI)	1 – Principal roads

Bus Stop Accessibility (BSA)	B2	Bus (B)	23 – Bus stop accessibility
Local Bus Priority Measures (BP)	B1		22 – Bus priority
Parallel Initiatives (PI)	PI1	'Parallel initiatives' on borough principal roads (PI)	13 – Parallel initiatives
Places and spaces			
Bridge Strengthening and Assessment (BR)	BR1 BR2	Bridges and structures (BR)	7 – Council bridges 8 – Non-council bridges
Local Safety Schemes (LSS)	LS1	Local safety schemes (LS)	28 – Local safety schemes
20mph zones (ZO)	TR1 TR2	Traffic calming in residential areas (TR)	27 – Traffic calming
Education Training and Publicity (ETP)	RS1 RS2	Road safety education and training (RS)	30 – Road safety
Town Centres (TC)	AB2	Area-based schemes (AB)	10 – Town Centres
Streets for People (SfP)	AB3		11 – Streets for People
Station Access (SA)	AB4		12 – Station access
Sustainability			
Walking (W)	W1 W2	Walking (W)	17 – Walking
Local Cycling Schemes (CS)	C2 C3 C4 C6	Cycling (C)	19 – Cycle routes; 20 – Cycle parking; 21 – Cycle training
London Cycle Network + (LCN+)	C1		18 – LCN+
Freight (FS)	F1 F2 F3	Freight (F)	25 – Freight
Regeneration Area Schemes (RP)	AB1	Area-based schemes (AB)	9 – Regeneration

Environment (ENV)	EN1 EN2 EN3	Environment (E)	32 – Environment
Controlled Parking Zones (PC)	P1 MS1	Parking (P)	26 – CPZs
Accessibility (AS)	AS2 AS3 AS4 AS5 AS6	Accessibility (AS)	14 – Pedestrian crossings; 15 – Safer routes to public transport; 16 – Accessibility
School Travel Plans (STP)	ST1 ST2	School travel (ST)	29 – School travel
Travel Awareness (TA)	TD2 TD3 W3 C5	Travel demand management (TD)	31 – Travel demand management
Work Travel Plans (WTP)	TD1		
Community Transport (CT)	AS4	Accessibility (AS)	16 – Accessibility

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 This ‘map’ is designed to assist Transport for London in matching up Islington’s Sustainable Transport Strategy with their original LIP Guidance. The annex below provides a more detailed ‘map’ showing where each individual requirement of the LIP Guidance ‘Matrix’ is addressed in the STS, and any changes made to the final draft LIP as a result of TfL’s response to the consultation draft STS.
- 5.2 The Form 1 ‘LIP Proposal Delivery Forms’ in appendix B provide further cross-references with the Mayor’s Transport Strategy policies and proposals. See the Form 2 ‘LIP Proposal Summary Sheet’ at the beginning of appendix B to determine which Form 1 relates to each proposal, and which MTS policies and proposals are fulfilled by each Islington STS proposal.

Annex: Islington Council’s responses to TfL’s response to consultation draft

NB. In the points where TfL determined that the consultation draft did not meet their requirement, the ‘No’ has been highlighted in red. All other text in red is either an addition or alteration made since the consultation draft.

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
3.Po5		Sustainable residential and town centre development: Boroughs are encouraged to set out their planning policy context and any plans to amend it in line with the London Plan.	Yes	Reference is made to Islington’s UDP (Ch3.10-12). There is little reference to the London Plan or specific planning policies. Recommend a section summarising section 3C of the London Plan and a commitment in the LIP to delivering the policies.	Chapter 3 of the final draft LIP contains a section summarising the London Plan that is consistent with Islington’s local planning policy. Supported. Islington’s planning context is set out in Islington’s current Unitary Development Plan (UDP), and is broadly consistent with the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (2001) and the London Plan (2004). The council has begun to review its planning policies in light of the new requirements for a Local Development Framework, and the new planning policy will be consistent with Islington’s LIP as well as with the London Plan.	See section on ‘London Plan’ in chapter 3	G13, AC6, E12	AB1-4
		Boroughs are also encouraged to support improved public transport and pedestrian environments as well as sustainable forms of residential and town centre development.	Yes	The LIP promotes use of sustainable forms of transport and makes reference to improved transport and pedestrian environments. This is set out in the borough proposals (ch4) and borough performance measures (ch7). Transport improvements are outlined very briefly in the area Transport Action Plans (Ch9-Ch12). The council’s overall transport goal in the UDP is: “To significantly reduce the adverse impact of road traffic on the environment, whilst providing adequate levels of accessibility. This should be achieved by a substantial reduction in the volume of motor traffic on Islington’s roads, through restraint measures, reducing the need to travel and local environmental improvement schemes; matched with substantial improvements to other transport modes, including walking, public transport, and cycling.” (overall goal 6) Islington supports improved public transport and pedestrian environments as well as sustainable forms of residential and town centre development. Islington’s UDP recognises that the need for more homes to be built in existing towns and cities, rather than in the countryside, would have a major impact in Islington (UDP, Part One, p.17). Strategic Policy ST5.1 states that "The council will: ensure the provision of a sufficient number of homes to meet local and strategic housing needs, insofar as this is compatible with maintaining a satisfactory residential environment." (UDP, Part One, p.22) The LP requires higher additional 'homes' targets and densities than those envisioned in the UDP and Islington will need to assess how much can be achieved within the local environment. UDP policy H12, page 152, states: “The council recognises that the density of new and converted residential development will vary significantly. In determining the appropriate density, the council will assess the following factors: i) the urban design context; ii) the design of the building which should be of high quality; iii) public transport accessibility; iv) the availability of local services and facilities; v) the suitability of the accommodation for the prospective occupier and the necessary management arrangements; vi) impact on residential amenity.” UDP paragraph 4.2.13, page 153, states: "Subject to the factors listed above, the normal maximum density will be 450 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) in Central London and in the Angel Town Centre, and 350 hrh elsewhere. Where higher densities are proposed, the council may require the preparation of a detailed 'impact statement', and in the light of this may seek appropriate S106 agreements." In practice, the council has considered residential densities as high as 1000 hrh.				

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
3.Po6		<p>Cultural life and 2012 Olympics: Boroughs are encouraged to include, where relevant, their transport plans associated with the cultural life of London.</p> <p>Boroughs are also encouraged to indicate what transport schemes, if any, they are proposing as part of the overall transport plan for the London Olympics 2012.</p>	Yes	<p>Islington believes that transport improvements can improve the cultural life and regeneration of areas.</p> <p>Islington supports Cross River Tram proposals via Kings Cross towards Finsbury Park to connect the Sobell Sports Centre and the new Emirates Football Stadium.</p>	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft. Chapter 2 of the final draft LIP contains a section summarising the successful Olympic bid, and the opportunities and challenges for the borough.</p> <p>Supported. Islington Council believes that transport improvements can help to strengthen Islington's cultural life and regeneration, especially along the A1 corridor. Islington has a major exhibition centre, two universities, four large hotels and dozens of theatres, art galleries, antique shops, restaurants and sport centres, some of national or regional importance. Two of the sporting facilities may have potential to host some London Olympic events. The council considers that Islington has an important cluster of cultural activities, with potential for more in the Clerkenwell, Angel, King's Cross and other areas. There is potential to open new stations on the North London Line and Piccadilly Line north and east of King's Cross.</p> <p>Islington supports Transport for London's recent initiatives in improving night-time services and bus services generally. Islington supports the extension of the East London Line to Highbury & Islington and Caledonian Road & Barnsbury stations. Islington also supports the extension of the current Cross River Tram proposal via King's Cross towards the Nag's Head town centre and Finsbury Park. Such an extension would serve sport facilities at the Sobell Centre and the Arsenal Football Club Emirates Stadium.</p> <p>Smaller local schemes will be implemented around King's Cross in conjunction with the Channel Tunnel Rail Link construction, and these improvements would contribute towards the transport plan for the London Olympics 2012.</p>	See section on 'London 2012 Olympics' in chapter 9	G11, AT4	AB4, B1, RU1, RU3
3.Po7		<p>Planning policy: Boroughs must demonstrate how they give due weight to these matters. In particular how they support the location of high density trip generating development in areas that have or will have both high levels of public transport accessibility and capacity, sufficient to meet the needs of development and how parking provision reflects levels of public transport accessibility.</p> <p>Boroughs are encouraged to include reference to the use of 'Public Transport Accessibility Levels' as a tool for assessing public transport accessibility.</p>	Yes	<p>The LIP States that major trip generating proposals require transport impact assessments including the use of 'Public Transport Accessibility Levels'.</p> <p>The LIP contains a number of specific development proposals at key locations particularly in what the LIP refers to as the 'Kings Cross to Finsbury Park Swathe' (Ch9). The LIP should recognise the importance of the relationship between development and transport, interchanges and intensification. However more links could be made between these and the London Plan policies and area strategies.</p>	<p>The final draft LIP contains a new proposal (AB1 – Regeneration schemes) setting out the council's intention to deliver transport and environmental improvements in Islington's regeneration areas.</p> <p>Supported. Islington is fully committed to ensuring that development is planned and located to provide a range of attractive and convenient travel choices, and to encouraging alternatives to car use, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (PPG13)6. Transport impact assessments are required for major trip generating proposals. These include public transport capacity and the use of 'Public Transport Accessibility Levels' as a tool for assessing public transport accessibility. (The map of Public Transport Accessibility Levels across Islington is published in chapter 2.) When assessing the transport impacts of new developments, as a planning and highway authority, the council encourages suitable applicants to prepare green travel plans promoting the best use of public transport, cycling and walking as part of their planned activities. And while the formal maximum parking standard in Islington is 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling, consistent with Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing (PPG3)17, increasing numbers of developments are being approved only with far less off-street parking space than this, and car-free housing is being secured where no off-street parking is provided and residents are ineligible for on-street residential parking permits.</p> <p>In terms of parking standards for employment and retail areas, the UDP established maximum standards, but once again, approved developments are often allowed even fewer spaces than the standard. A relatively small amount of employee and public parking is available in Islington, and this number is decreasing rather than increasing due to more attractive uses for valuable land in central and inner London.</p> <p>The council seeks developer contributions for transport and other improvements whenever</p>	See new proposal in chapter 4	G14, E10, E12	AB1

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
					appropriate. These contributions can include not only transport environment and access improvements but also car club membership for new residents or a requirement for developers or future occupiers to develop a green travel plan to reduce car use. Zonal travel plans are also being explored for the borough's town and district centres to guide and enhance individual businesses' travel plans. The council is currently implementing its own green travel plan to show leadership to other organisations in the borough.			
3.Po8		<p>Development and public transport: Boroughs are encouraged to include evidence of support for high quality, higher density and mixed use development in locations where there are, or will be, high levels of public transport accessibility and capacity.</p>	Yes		<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft.</p> <p>Supported. Islington's STS and UDP both seek to "ensure that all new development maximises accessibility by sustainable modes of transport, meets relevant highways and access standards and is properly related to the borough's transport and highways network" (UDP policy ST7-6.8). The council is working to regenerate and develop a number of suitable areas and sites for high quality, carefully designed, higher density and mixed-use development in locations where there are high levels of public transport access and capacity.</p> <p>Islington lies adjacent to King's Cross, a key development and interchange point, to be enhanced by the Channel Tunnel Rail Terminal in Camden. The council has identified a potential 'swathe' for regeneration in an arc between King's Cross and Finsbury Park, another highly accessible 'hub' node undergoing its own regeneration programme. The council has also identified the A1 corridor as a key community regeneration project running through the heart of Islington and linking the City fringes to the Angel, Nag's Head and Archway town centres.</p> <p>Islington has given consideration to the provision of a tram depot as part of a possible extension of the Cross River Tram through the potential swathe for regeneration between King's Cross and Finsbury Park. This proposal is still in development.</p> <p>The potential for major freight interchanges between road, rail and water in Islington has been substantially reduced since the second world war by the redevelopment or change of use of much of the land and buildings alongside the railway lines and the Regent's Canal.</p>	G12, G14, AC6	AB1-4, B3, RU1, RU3	
		<p>Boroughs are also encouraged to provide evidence of the provision of suitable sites for public transport and freight distribution centres and interchanges.</p>	Yes	Islington note that the potential for freight interchanges within the borough is limited.				
3.Po9		<p>Equality and social inclusion: Boroughs are encouraged to include actions to support adequate transport provision for deprived areas and all social groups, particularly equality and inclusion target groups.</p>	Yes	<p>The borough is encouraged to include actions to improve transport in most deprived areas. The Final LIP would benefit from a map showing the areas of deprivation overlaid with transport proposals so as to see how they relate to each other.</p>	<p>The final draft LIP contains a new proposal (AB1 – Regeneration schemes) setting out the council's intention to deliver transport and environmental improvements in Islington's regeneration areas, which are outlined in chapter 9 (Regeneration and major transport projects). Chapter 2 contains maps of the key regeneration areas and the major public transport infrastructure projects and proposals in Islington. All areas of deprivation will soon be able to be overlaid with transport proposals on Interactive Islington (see the summary of this strategy to learn how to use Interactive Islington).</p> <p>Supported. One element of the council's 'One Islington' vision is to make Islington "a place</p>	See chapter 9 and proposal AB1 in chapter 4	AC1, AC2, AC3, AC4, AC5, AC7, SA7	AB1, AB4, HI4, AS1, AS2, AS4, AS5, AS6, W2, B2, TD3

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
					<p>where people of all backgrounds are able to realise their full potential" (Islington's Corporate Performance Plan, p.17). In addition, it is one of Islington's four key priorities to meet the needs of all of its customers and to involve and empower its communities and individuals. Consistent with these priorities, this STS has undergone an Equality Impact Assessment to determine that its implementation will not unfairly disadvantage any specific groups or communities based on age, race, disability, gender, income, sexuality, religion, employment status or nationality. In addition, all individual schemes undergo a smaller-scale Equalities Impact Assessment at implementation phase.</p> <p>In large projects, such as the 'A1 Borough', the council aims to ensure that all local stakeholders are fully engaged in debating and determining the future of the area. 'Hard-to-reach' groups and individuals are specifically targeted. As part of Islington's Best Value Review of 'People Friendly Streets', the council consulted widely and deeply with representatives of all sections of the community. One of the actions arising out of this review is to set up a local mobility forum, the first meeting of which will be held during the STS consultation period. The council has also set up a Blue Badge User's Forum, and has developed 'Live Long and Prosper', a quality of life strategy for Islington residents aged fifty-five and over, and the 'Islington Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership'. Internally, Islington Council operates a full equal opportunities employment policy.</p> <p>Islington has also led on actual project delivery to help address transport inequalities. We are working in partnership with Camden Council to deliver the Scootability scooter loan scheme for older people with mobility difficulties and a hail-and-ride PlusBus network open to anyone with mobility difficulties.</p>			
3.Pr1	V	<p>Mobility forum and consultation: Boroughs must state how they ensure that local voluntary and community organisations, including disabled groups, are fully consulted on relevant proposals developed by boroughs to meet these objectives.</p> <p>Boroughs must include information on Local Mobility Forums, where relevant.</p>	Yes	See comments under 4O.Pr9.	<p>Updated details on the local Mobility Forum are contained in chapter 4 (proposal AS1). The Terms of reference has been provided to TfL, but is not included in the final draft LIP as it is subject to change on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Supported. On top of the council's corporate consultation strategy, a transport consultation strategy has been developed. This strategy highlights the importance of reaching hard-to-reach groups.</p> <p>The council's mobility forum will be an important element of our consultation strategy, allowing us to consult strategically on overarching transport policy in addition to the scheme-specific consultation that is carried out, which also focuses on equalities issues. The mobility forum will meet quarterly and will bring together key mobility stakeholders and people with various disabilities.</p>	See proposal AS1 in chapter 4	AC2, AC4, AC5	AS1, AS4-6
3.Pr2	VI	<p>Air quality: Boroughs must have regard to the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy and are encouraged to set out how they are addressing its priorities relevant to their transport responsibilities.</p>	Yes		<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft.</p> <p>Supported. Islington Council published its Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) in August 2003 and our progress is regularly monitored. Although the most concentrated pollution levels are around the A1 and A503 corridors, the AQAP declared the entire borough as an Air Quality Management Area to allow more effective air pollution reduction. The AQAP sets out numerous measures to deal with traffic related pollution, which is the single most important local source of air pollution in the borough. Proposed measures include a Low Emission Zone, Clear Zones, infrastructure for refuelling with cleaner fuels, roadside emission testing and enforcement,</p>		G4, SA3, G1, G2	EN1, TD1, TD2, W3, C5

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		Boroughs must set out their policy response to they key proposal for an LEZ.	Yes		freight management, reduced traffic speed zones, reduced traffic congestion, traffic calming, clearer signing, improved provisions for cycling and walking, quality partnerships with public transport service providers, parking control, reduced parking charges for 'green' vehicles, city car club, green travel plans and other incentives for greener travel options (AQAP, Section 4, pages 11-26). These measures have now been adopted within the STS.			
		Reference must be made to boroughs' Air Quality Management Area Action Plans where relevant.	Yes		<p>Islington's UDP commits to implementing the national air quality strategy, and intends to reach the national air quality objectives as specified in the Air Quality Regulations 2000 (UDP policy Env18). UDP strategic policy ST4 (Environment) aims to "minimise noise pollution and nuisance and improve air quality." A range of STS and UDP targets support these policies. Unfortunately, due to the amount of pollution generated outside of Islington, national air quality targets have not been met for NO_x and PM₁₀ by 2005. See chapter 4 proposal EN1 and the SEA Environmental Report, appendix I, for more information on air pollution in Islington.</p> <p>There are a number of Mayor's Air Quality Strategy (MAQS) priorities that are relevant to Islington's transport responsibilities. We have briefly addressed each below.</p> <p>Reducing traffic and improving public transport (MAQS priority 4A, p88): Islington's Vision for the 21st Century (UDP policy ST1) seeks to "improve accessibility whilst reducing the amount of road traffic and its adverse impact on the environment." Much of this LIP is focused on reducing traffic and promoting more sustainable forms of travel.</p> <p>Cleaner road vehicles (MAQS priority 4B, p92): Islington is 'greening' its own fleet and transport practices as part of our Green Travel Plan and vehicle replacement programme. Currently 95% of the diesel vehicle fleet use low-sulphur diesel. Our new depot provides a refuelling facility for liquid petroleum gas (LPG), and it is intended to replace most of the conventional petrol vehicle fleet with LPG, dual-fuel or cleaner vehicle options over the next few years. The council also promotes vehicle replacement in other organisations in the borough through our workplace travel plan promotion program. Occasional roadside emission testing also contributes towards cleaner road vehicles.</p> <p>Low emission zones (MAQS priority 4C, p66): Islington Council believes that an LEZ for London would be beneficial to the borough. The council is currently working with the ALG, the GLA and other London boroughs to arrive at a joint decision on whether to implement a London LEZ (AQAP, paragraph 4.1.1).</p> <p>Proposals by vehicle type (MAQS priority 4D, p71): Islington Council strongly supports electric vehicles. We are currently developing a pilot scheme for on-street electric vehicle recharging points. We have also adjusted our parking permit charges to encourage purchase of electric vehicles.</p> <p>Traffic management (MAQS priority 4E, p88): In the recently completed Barnsbury area traffic reduction scheme, Islington has achieved average traffic reductions of 26% and 30% in the morning and evening peaks. This is consistent with the UDP policy to "promote a programme of traffic management and calming schemes on local roads to reduce traffic in residential streets, to improve the environment and to benefit pedestrians and cyclists." (UDP Transport policy T15)</p> <p>London borough partnerships (MAQS priority 5B, p245): Islington is working proactively and co-operatively with its partners to reduce air pollution levels across London.</p>			

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
3.Pr4	VI	<p>Noise: Boroughs must state their policies with respect to traffic and transport related noise</p>	Yes	<p>Islington's UDP strategic policy ST4 (Environment) aims to minimise noise pollution. The UDP also contains policies to integrate transport with development, thereby minimising adverse environmental impacts such as noise. Islington has a range of policies to counter against the negative impacts of transport especially noise (UDP Policy ENV 17)</p>	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft.</p> <p>Supported. Islington's UDP strategic policy ST4 (Environment) aims to minimise noise pollution, and the UDP also contains policies to integrate transport with development, thereby minimising adverse environmental impacts such as noise. "When considering applications for new development and changes of use, ... planning permission will not be granted to developments which cause unacceptable levels of noise, smell, smoke, air pollution, vibration, danger or other forms of disturbance or nuisance, either directly or as a result of the traffic generated by the scheme" (UDP Policy Env 17).</p>		G3, SA3	EN2, TD1, TD2, W3, C5, F1
		<p>and relevant borough activities relating to reducing traffic and transport related traffic noise.</p>	Yes		<p>Islington's STS is also committed to reducing traffic-related noise. The main techniques that will continue to be employed in Islington include routing traffic away from sensitive areas, promoting quieter vehicles and encouraging quieter, smoother and safer driving. Islington supports the London Lorry Ban, which restricts vehicles over 18 tonnes mgw, and is introducing more local 7.5 tonne lorry bans in residential areas. Improved noise reducing surfaces are being explored for use where necessary as part of road maintenance. The council uses traffic calming designs that minimise road noise.</p> <p>The London Road Traffic Noise Map published in September 2004 (see chapter 1) shows that the worst affected areas in Islington lie within the congestion charging zone and along the Pentonville Road, City Road, St. Paul's Road, Ball's Pond Road, Holloway Road, Camden Road, Parkhurst Road and Seven Sisters Road. Specific problem sites we are aware of in relation to the Underground or the National Rail network in Islington include Thameslink along King's Cross Road, and we continue to work with the SRA and rail operators to address rail-related noise issues.</p> <p>The A1 Borough project can offer a valuable opportunity to address issues relating to road traffic noise along an important main road corridor. Islington recognises that good spatial design can ameliorate noise and will seek to incorporate this in new development and streetscape proposals.</p> <p>In addition, the council has adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on Green Construction, which includes guidance on reducing noise during construction, and the council's Streetbook design manual has been developed to help address noise impacts.</p>			
3.Pr5	VI	<p>Biodiversity: Boroughs are encouraged to have regard to the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy and also to include details of how they intend to protect and enhance natural habitats and biodiversity along their transport routes (cycleways, verges etc.).</p>	Yes	<p>The Council is committed to the principle of nature conservation, and will seek to protect and enhance existing sites of nature importance and to create new wildlife habitats. The borough will also promote a greater awareness of nature conservation and biodiversity issues (UDP Policy Env 21).</p>	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft.</p> <p>Supported. The council is committed to the principle of nature conservation, and will seek to protect and enhance existing sites of nature importance and to create new wildlife habitats ... and will promote a greater awareness of nature conservation and biodiversity issues ... (UDP Policy Env 21). The UDP identifies four Nature Conservation Sites that are of Metropolitan Importance, two along the Regent's canal and two on disused railway land. A further 24 sites are of Borough Importance, nine of them along road or railway cuttings. Another 25 sites are of Local Importance. Islington supports a consistent approach to nature conservation on transport land. A Biodiversity Action Plan has been adopted (2004), and the STS has been developed to contribute towards it. See chapter 4 proposal EN5 and the SEA Statement.</p>		G7	EN5

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
3.Pr6	VI	Waste: Boroughs must set out how they seek to encourage the movement of waste by rail or water or otherwise reduce the impact of the transport of waste.	Yes	This is supported by the borough though they note that there is very limited opportunity for transferring waste to rail or water. TfL would welcome details of the work undertaken to arrive at this point of view. Islington notes the difficulties in developing waste to rail and water in the borough due to lack of facilities and difficulties in creating new facilities.	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft. The council is not aware of any opportunities for transferring waste by rail or water, and funding is not currently available to carry out a comprehensive study into this issue.</p> <p>Supported. Islington has very limited opportunity for transferring waste to rail and water transport. Rail track in Islington is either in cuttings or on embankments. The redevelopment of the King's Cross railway lands across the border in Camden will close down any opportunities for waste transfer at King's Cross. Similarly, the Regent's Canal in Islington has lost its commercial character and offers little opportunity for waste transfer. Any access to the rail and water network may have to be facilitated outside the borough. Atomic waste is carried along the North London Line.</p> <p>However, the recent opening of the new Hornsey Street Reuse and Recycling Centre has the potential to reduce the distance waste has to be transported for processing.</p> <p>All waste vehicles in Islington run on ultra-low sulphur diesel, and household kerb-side recycling is collected using small electric vehicles.</p> <p>The Central London sub-region has yet to set up a FQP. Islington Council is in the process of developing a FQP as part of this STS, and hopes to include neighbouring boroughs in order to consider shared freight routes, including possible rail and water access.</p>		E13	EN4
3.Pr7		Health: Boroughs are encouraged to demonstrate how they will contribute to improving the health of Londoners, for example by promoting workplace and school travel plans and thus reducing accidents.	Yes	The LIP sets out strategy policies and programmes on how the borough will help to promote the health of Londoners. The LIP demonstrates this by identifying current and future proposals for walking, cycling, improving road safety (traffic calming, local safety schemes and education / training means), traffic reduction, safer routes to school, school travel plans (green travel plans) etc.	<p>Chapter 3 of the final draft LIP contains a section on the London Health Strategy, which was developed by the London Health Commission (LHC). Islington Council supports the work of the LHC through a number of council strategies, as well as transport proposals in the STS.</p> <p>Supported. Islington's LIP improves public health in four main ways: (i) more active transport options such as walking and cycling are promoted across the age spectrum, from Safer Routes to School proposals involving children and parents, to workplace-based green travel promotion, to schemes and events to encourage walking by older people; (ii) traffic reduction measures contribute to improved public health by discouraging unhealthy sedentary lifestyles; (iii) improving road safety through an active programme of road accident analysis, local safety scheme design, performance monitoring and scheme review; and (iv) reducing traffic-related air pollution (as outlined earlier).</p> <p>Islington has also developed a health inequalities strategy to ensure that no council initiative adversely affects the health of any groups, individuals and geographic areas of the borough.</p>	See section on 'London Health Strategy in chapter 3	SA3, SA4, SA5, SA7, G10, G11, G13	TD1, TD2, W3, C5, LS1, ST2
		Boroughs are also encouraged to review and summarise how they interact with the London Health Commission on transport related activities.	No	Although the LIP identifies policy areas where the borough will work in partnership with other stakeholders, it does not refer to the London Health Commission (LHC) and gives no information on how the borough will interact with LHC on transport related activities.				
4C.Pr12		Underground security issues: Relevant boroughs are encouraged to include a reference to their crime and disorder strategies; indicate how and when they will be updated and how the GLA and TfL will be consulted.	Yes	The borough is encouraged to specify the consultation arrangements relating to the crime, drug and anti social behaviour strategy including that with GLA and TfL. The document makes reference to the borough's Crime Disorder and drugs misuse Strategy. Perusal of this document, however, has no specific reference to transport related crime and disorder.	Islington's Crime Disorder and Drugs Misuse Strategy does include consideration of transport-related crime, and Transport for London are a member of the Safer Islington Partnership which developed the strategy. In addition, chapter 2 of the LIP contains a section on 'transport-related crime', and the emergency services are specifically listed in chapter 6 as key stakeholders who are consulted on every council transport scheme. The council works in partnership with the Metropolitan Police to design out opportunities for crime where possible in all transport schemes.	See chapters 2 and 6, and proposals AB4 and SN1 in chapter 4	SE1, SE3	AB4, TX1

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		Relevant boroughs are encouraged to include ways in which they promote TfL's 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives as well as their own proposals for improving personal safety and security in getting to and from the Underground (as well as DLR and national rail) stations.	No	The borough is encouraged to identify those stations that may benefit from a "Station Access" scheme, especially those that would promote "Safer Travel at Night", and complete LIP Proposal Delivery Form(s) where appropriate. The borough is encouraged to indicate ways it promotes the Mayor's 'Safer Travel at Night' initiative. The LIP contains an intention to promote and facilitate safer travel options as well as approaches to improve personal safety of private hire vehicle passengers to support TfL's Safer at Night Initiative. However, there is no detailed STAN programme outlined in the document.	The final draft LIP identifies stations that may benefit from a station access scheme (proposal AB4). In terms of 'Safer travel at night', chapter 4 of the final draft LIP contains a new proposal (SN1), which is cross-referenced in the Form 1 of all proposals that will contribute towards proposal SN1. Proposal SN1 identifies stations where improved access for night-time travel is necessary. Supported. Islington's Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy 2002-2005 aims to build safer communities by reducing crime, disorder and the fear of crime. It is based on regular monitoring and developed with the support of the Islington Crime Reduction Partnership, which includes the Metropolitan Police, Islington Drug and Alcohol Action Team, Youth Offending Team, Probation Services, Islington Primary Care Trust, Islington Victim Support, Islington Business Design Centre, Arsenal Football Club, Magistrates Court (and Youth Service), Crown Prosecution Service, Neighbourhood Watch and Borough Fire Brigade. A new Crime, Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy 2005-2007 was published in March 2005, and the STS has been developed to contribute towards this. One of the six key objectives of the STS is to make the borough's transport environment more secure. Parts of Islington have developed a popular night-life. The safety and security of people using the public transport system will be one of the concerns of the new crime reduction strategy, as well as the STS itself. Islington will pursue a range of 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives as part of the STS.			
4D.Pr3	V	Relevant boroughs must set out their relevant planning policy context to improve accessibility to the DLR and its surrounding environment and services.	N/A		Not applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
4D.Pr4		Relevant boroughs are encouraged to include infrastructure context plans for new DLR stations which identify how they are or will be integrated into the surrounding area to improve physical access. In addition, relevant boroughs are encouraged to outline their commitment to work with TfL to assist in the development of proposals for DLR extensions.	N/A N/A		Not applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
4D.Pr5		Relevant boroughs are encouraged to include projects to address these issues.	N/A		Not applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
4D.Pr6	V	Relevant boroughs must include projects which will widen accessibility gains from Tramlink and identify benchmark accessibility standards they will use and measures of success.	N/A		Not applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
4D.Pr7		Relevant boroughs are encouraged to include any measures or proposals being taken to support this proposal.	N/A		Not applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
4E.Pr7		Rail and planning policy: Boroughs are encouraged to set out, in this regard, their planning policy context and any plans to amend it in line with the London Plan.	Yes	Objectives and Policies are in line with the London Plan although it is hard to identify where any amendments could be undertaken.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Islington's planning policy context is set out in chapter 3. See also the section in chapter 9 on 'Major public transport infrastructure proposals'.		G12	RU1, RU3
4E.Pr8		Rail freight: Boroughs are encouraged to	Yes	LIP states "Supported" (see statement under	No significant changes from the consultation draft.		E13	

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		identify sites for freight handling in their planning documents.		assessment for 3.Po8). See 3.Po8 above. The borough is committed to working with TfL to improve the freight distribution, even though the potential for this is limited within the borough. Contrary to the LIP's statement some of the potential sites for freight use in Islington have been lost more recently than the 2nd World War.	Supported. Islington will work with TfL and other partners to improve freight distribution by rail in Islington. However, the potential for major freight interchanges between road, rail and water in Islington has been substantially reduced since the second world war by the redevelopment or change of use of much of the land and buildings alongside the railway lines and the Regent's Canal.			
4E.Pr9	V	Rail security issues: Boroughs must include supporting measures/schemes and must include a reference to their crime and disorder strategies; indicate how and when they will be updated and how the GLA and TfL will be consulted (as per 4C.Pr12). Boroughs are encouraged to include ways in which they promote TfL's 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives.	No	The borough should specify the consultation arrangements relating to the crime, drug and anti-social behaviour strategy including that with GLA and TfL. The borough should look to identify those stations that may benefit from a "Station Access" scheme, especially those that would promote "Safer Travel at Night", and complete LIP Proposal Delivery Form(s) where appropriate. The borough is encouraged to indicate ways it promotes the Mayor's 'Safer Travel at Night' initiative. The borough has a wide variety of initiatives and proposals to make the streets and environs safer for people but none appear to be specifically aimed at rail travellers.	See section above in relation to MTS 4C.Pr12, Underground security issues. Supported. Specifically, Islington will pursue a range of 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives as part of the Sustainable Transport Strategy and will work in partnership with TfL and rail operators to make stations and their surroundings more secure. See also section in chapter 9 on 'Major public transport infrastructure developments'.	See proposals AB4 and SN1 in chapter 4	SE1, SE3	AB4, TX1
4E.Pr10		Rail interchanges: Boroughs are encouraged to set out their programme(s) to implement their elements of the Interchange Plan.	Yes	The proposal is clearly set out and supported by the borough. A partnership with TfL has been fostered and specific proposals are put forward for Finsbury Park and Highbury and Islington. Action seems to be more one of support for TfL/NR initiatives rather than Council led initiatives. Reference is made to the fact that many of Islington's stations serve as local interchanges, and that improvements will be made, but no specific projects are detailed.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Islington is working with TfL's Interchanges team to improve the connectivity between the London Underground, NLL and Thameslink stations. We are particularly focusing on improvements to Finsbury Park, Highbury and Islington and Archway stations.		G12	AB4
4E.Pr13	V	Rail station accessibility: Boroughs must set out programmes for projects to contribute towards improved accessibility of rail stations.	No	The borough should identify the stations where it considers improvements are needed over the lifetime of the LIP and include the details in the LIP Proposal Delivery Form where appropriate.	Proposal RU1 contains a list of the types of improvements that are sought at all stations. The ten-year programme for 'Station access' (appendix A, proposal AB4) lists the specific stations that are most in need of improvements. The final draft LIP also contains a new chapter on major transport projects (chapter 9), which outlines necessary improvements to specific rail stations that have been identified by the council. Supported. See section in chapter 9 on 'Major public transport infrastructure developments', and proposal AB4 on 'Station access' in chapter 4.	See chapter 9, and proposal AB4 in chapter 4	AC1, G12	AB4
4E.Pr14		Park-and-ride: Boroughs are encouraged to set out proposals, if any, for park-and-ride.	Yes	The borough states there are no suitable sites for park and ride in Islington. Solid reasons are given for this, particularly in the Parking and Enforcement Plan and an alternative strategy to further promote public transport is put forward.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Not applicable. There are no suitable locations for park-and-ride facilities in Islington. Islington Council intends to promote use of public transport for the entire journey rather than facilitating car commuting for part of the journey. All stations in the borough are in zones 1 and 2.		N/A	N/A
4E.Po3		Parking provision at rail stations: Boroughs are encouraged to include a	Yes	The LIP includes a 'Parking Enforcement Plan' which sets out an extensive strategy for the	No significant changes from the consultation draft. CPZs are designed to encourage more people to walk, cycle or use public transport instead of driving. While the council has not carried	See Parking	N/A	N/A

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		programme for review of existing parking provision.		borough. There is some emphasis on reducing parking in the borough. Off-street parking at stations is correctly dismissed as not applicable, but some discussion of impact of CPZs on existing and potential rail use would benefit the Final LIP.	out specific studies to determine the exact impacts of new CPZs on rail patronage, we can provide the start dates and parking beat data for existing CPZs for TfL to calculate the impacts of each new CPZ on public transport use in that area. Not applicable. All stations in the borough are in zones 1 and 2. There are no station car parks in Islington, and provision of increased parking for rail passengers would be inconsistent with this strategy, particularly policies G2 and SA3.	Policy Statement (appendix E)		
4F.Pr2	II	Bus route management: Boroughs must demonstrate support for the effective enforcement of bus priority (see also Target 3, Proposal 4F.Pr7 and relevant policies in Chapter 4G of the MTS).	Yes		The final draft LIP contains a reference to the council's Winter Service Policy and Plan under proposal HI10 (Winter services) in chapter 4. This operational plan (provided to TfL) outlines duties and obligations in terms of keeping streets free from ice and snow, so far as reasonably practical. Supported. Islington awaits details on target 4 from TfL.	See 'Winter services' proposal in chapter 4 (HI10)	G12	B1, B3, HI10
		Boroughs must develop and agree Target 4 with TfL for improving journey times by summer 2005.	N/A	Islington awaits details of Target 4 from TfL. (borough consultation in target now complete – July 2005).				
		Boroughs must set out their standards for gritting on bus routes during periods of cold weather.	No	This is not specified. Islington to forward details to TfL BPT.				
4F.Pr3	II	Bus standing and garage facilities: Boroughs must demonstrate their commitment to support provision of bus standing and garage facilities at agreed locations in association with London Buses, and identify projects they are implementing. This must include the development of appropriate planning policies.	No	Supported but no plans or projects indicated in the future years. The Final LIP must include commitment to the development of appropriate planning policies.	Supported. Although space in Islington is limited, Islington Council will work with London Buses and bus operators to accommodate bus standing and garage facilities where appropriate. The 2006/07 bus priority programme does not contain any schemes for bus stands. The council's bus priority programme outlined in chapter 4 and appendix A includes the review of any requests from TfL for new bus stands and the implementation where possible. For example, on the route 38 corridor scheme we have liaised with TfL on curtailment points and bus stands for bendy buses (extension and access). Current planning policies T35 and T37 within the UDP support the provision of an adequate bus services in the borough. The consultation draft version of Islington's 'LDF Core Planning Strategy' contains a policy (CS7 – Infrastructure) dealing with sufficient infrastructure for accommodating growth and change.		G12, E1	B1, B3
4F.Pr6	II	Bus priority: Boroughs must detail effective bus priority programmes dealing with both streetspace allocation and hours of operation, to significantly reduce bus delay and journey time variability across the bus network.	Yes	Supported in Chapter 4 & Appendix A for both Bus Priority and Bus Accessibility Programmes.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. See 'Bus priority' proposal in chapter 4 and programme in appendix A.		G12, E1	B1
4F.Pr7	II	Bus lane enforcement: Boroughs must include a summary or reference to the boroughs' enforcement Service Level Agreements (or equivalent) with TfL, and details of how these will be regularly reviewed and monitored.	No	Islington must mention the Service Level Agreement that it has with TfL and provide information on its review and monitoring.	Supported. The council intends to give increased attention to the enforcement of bus routes and lanes, as part of – and funded by – the London Bus Initiative and TfL. See the updated 'Bus priority' proposal (B1) in chapter 4, and the section on 'Parking at bus stops and in bus lanes' in the Parking Policy Statement, appendix E.	See Parking Policy Statement, appendix E	G12, E1, E11, SA8	B1
		Boroughs must set out the local clearways programme.	Yes	A Bus Clearway Programme is supported to comply with MTS requirements.				

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4F.Pr8	III	Bus priority on 'A Roads and Busy Bus Routes' : Boroughs must include agreed programmes, plans and proposals to demonstrate delivery of high levels of bus priority on 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes.	No	Supported but no specific programmes indicated in Chapter 4 with reference to 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes.	Supported. The Bus Priority programme (chapter 4 and appendix A) will enhance bus priority on all 'A roads and busy bus routes'. Appendix A in the final draft LIP provides further detail of the bus priority schemes the council intends to undertake over the next ten years. The bus priority proposal in chapter 4 has been expanded to state that most of the bus priority schemes proposed in Appendix A will be on the Strategic Road Network and/or 'A Roads or Busy Bus Routes'. As such, the specific consultation requirements of schemes on these roads will be followed.	See proposal B1, chapter 4	G12, E1	B1
		Boroughs must demonstrate that consistent and high levels of traffic enforcement will be integral to their proposals and that there is consistency with the accessible bus network proposals.	Yes					
		Boroughs must demonstrate that all boroughs' road proposals and programmes include measures that mitigate any significant adverse impacts on buses on major bus corridors.	Yes	Mitigating and Enabling works supported.				
4F.Pr11	V	Bus stop accessibility : Boroughs must set out their programme for making all bus stops accessible.	Yes	The borough is to indicate the proportion of bus stops to be made accessible at the end of the planned programme and a timetable for all bus stops to become accessible.	Supported. See Bus Stop Accessibility section in chapter 4. Appendix A in the final draft LIP provides further detail of the 24 bus stop accessibility schemes programmed up to and including 2008/09, identification of a further two schemes for completion and funding for bus stop accessibility schemes in 2009-16. There are approximately 500 bus stops on borough roads in Islington. In 2005/06 there were 14 schemes carried out, as a proportion this is 3% of the bus stops in the borough. However, 34 schemes have been carried out so far and bus stops are also improved as part of bus priority schemes and other works, such as repaving and resurfacing schemes, safety schemes and S.106 and S.278 agreements. It is hoped that by the end of this ten-year strategy, all bus stops within the borough will be fully accessible.		G12, AC1, AC4	B2
4F.Pr21	IV	Coach parking : Central London boroughs must include a commitment to produce a strategy and programme for implementation of coach parking in cooperation with TfL. Other boroughs must include the issue if appropriate.	Yes	Islington's commitment to produce the strategy and programme is welcome, and must be present in the final version of the Parking Plan. While the involvement of other partners will strengthen the strategy, whether or not neighbouring boroughs co-operate, the strategy must nevertheless be produced. If any implementation is required and is practicable under the strategy, Islington must produce a programme for that implementation. TfL is willing to work with the borough on the production of its strategy.	Supported. See new section on 'Coach parking' in the Parking Policy Statement, appendix E.	See section on coach parking in appendix E	SA3, E1, E10	
4G.Pr1	IV	Powered two-wheeler parking : Boroughs must include details of their strategy and programmes for implementing powered two-wheeler parking particularly in areas of high demand.	Yes	Although the PEP does not state exactly how demand for PTW parking is measured, conversations with a borough officer revealed that site surveys, consultation with user groups and residents are used. This should be clearly stated in the PEP.	Supported. See the Parking Policy Statement (appendix E) and Motorcycle and Scooter Action Plan (appendix H). Motorcycle and scooter parking to be provided in controlled parking zones where necessary and in other locations where theft is a particular problem. The final draft LIP more clearly sets out the council's strategy and programmes for implementing motorcycle and scooter parking, particularly in areas of high demand.	See sections on 'Motorcycle and scooter parking' in appendices E and H	E10, G2	MS1, P1

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4G.Po2	III	Road user hierarchy: In balancing the use of street space boroughs must have regard to the presumptions set out in Policy 4G.Po2.	No	Islington's opposition to 4G.Po2 is noted. In order to achieve a compliant Final LIP, a statement should be made that regard will be paid to the presumptions of policy 4G.Po2. If Islington wishes to further note that the needs of this Policy will be reconciled against other parts of the MTS which may at times conflict (for example, Road Safety, and the promotion of walking and cycling), then that would be reasonable.	Supported. Islington Council will have regard to the presumptions of policy 4G.Po2. However, as outlined in ch.4 (see proposal PI1, 'Parallel initiatives'), the council's road hierarchy (policy E1) gives priority to more vulnerable road users on all roads in Islington including principal roads. This means reconciling this MTS policy with other MTS policies focused on reducing road traffic casualties and encouraging modal shift towards walking, cycling and public transport.	See 'Parallel initiatives' proposal (PI1) in chapter 4	E1, G12	B1
4G.Pr2		Traffic enforcement: Boroughs are encouraged to work with other agencies to improve data sharing protocols, including their participation in or support of the work of the ETF.	Yes	The authority has referred to its participation in the London-wide TRACE system.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. The council will work with partners to improve enforcement in Islington.		SA1, SA2, E11	
4G.Pr3		Enforcement legislation: Boroughs are encouraged to set out any relevant plans.	Yes		No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported.		SA1, SA2, E11	
4G.Pr4	II	Camera enforcement of bus lanes: Boroughs must include a programme for bringing signage up to the standards required by the DfT.	Yes	The authority has referred to a review of waiting and loading restrictions in the context of CPZs.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. The council is working to roll-out camera enforcement of bus lanes throughout Islington and bring all signage up to standard.		G12, E11	B1
4G.Pr7	I	Road safety: Boroughs must include the latest version of their Road Safety Plan as an integral part of their LIP	Yes	The LIP contains the latest version of Islington's Road Safety Plan and forms an integral part of the document. Information is also provided on how Target 1 is to be met locally.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Islington's Road Safety Plan is included as appendix C. The plan includes details of how LIP Target 1 will be achieved, and progress on implementation will be reported annually.		SA1, SA2, SA4, SA5, G10, G11	TR1, LS1, ST2, RS1, ST1
		and must explain how Target 1 is to be met locally.	Yes	The Road Safety Plan included in Islington's LIP updates the Council's 2002 plan and forms part of its Sustainable Transport Strategy.				
		Boroughs must review their Road Safety Plan annually and provide progress updates.	Yes	The Road Safety Plan included in Islington's LIP updates the Council's 2002 plan and forms part of its Sustainable Transport Strategy.				
4G.Pr9	I	School road safety: Boroughs must include a programme for the review of road safety around all primary and secondary schools and, where relevant, other sites by 2008 with consideration given to use of 20mph zones.	Yes	The School Travel Strategy included in Islington's LIP identifies Islington's programme for reviewing road safety around all schools in the borough by 2008-09.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Islington's programme for reviewing and implementing school road safety is outlined in the School Travel Strategy, appendix D.		SA2, SA4, SA5	TR1, ST2, RS1
4G.Pr10	VI	Streets for People: Boroughs must include a programme for identification and review of potential schemes as well as programmes and funding assumptions for implementing agreed schemes and in particular supporting the Mayor's programme for 100 public spaces. (See LIP Guidance Chapter 7.)	Yes	Areas of deprivation and key locations for regeneration have been identified in the LIP. It is noted that the LIP states that Streets for People schemes will be focused on the A1 corridor, however, this is a large area and consequently no clear relationship was shown between the location of potential Streets for People schemes and the most deprived areas, regeneration areas or areas of high density neighbourhood renewal. It is suggested that locations where Streets for People schemes would be focused are identified on a map together with areas of high deprivation, regeneration and neighbourhood renewal.	Supported. Islington will deliver a programme of area-based 'Streets for People' schemes as discussed in chapter 4, in particular supporting the Highbury Corner project in the Mayor's programme for 100 public spaces. Schemes will be chosen based on numerous criteria, including local safety, security, deprivation and community involvement. Future schemes are likely to be delivered in and around the A1 corridor, the EC1 New Deal for Communities area and local shopping centres designated in the council's planning policy. All areas of deprivation will soon be able to be overlaid with transport proposals on Interactive Islington (see the summary of this strategy to learn how to use Interactive Islington).	See proposal AB3 in chapter 4 and programme in appendix A	AC6, G10	AB3

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4G.Pr11	VI	Town centre environmental improvements: Boroughs must set out how they plan to work jointly with TfL to develop a plan of environmental street improvements to enhance the attractiveness of London's town centres.	Yes	The borough should identify the town centre(s) it is looking to improve over the lifetime of the LIP.	Supported. Islington will deliver a programme of town centre schemes as discussed in chapter 4 and appendix A.	See proposal AB2 and programme in appendix A	AT2, AC6, G10	AB2
4G.Pr12	III	Traffic reduction: Boroughs must include their local traffic growth forecasts and set out how they expect their policies to contribute to meeting the traffic reduction targets in Proposal 4G.Pr12.	Yes		No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. The MTS traffic reduction target (reduction in weekday traffic of 15% in central London and zero growth across the rest of inner London between 2001 and 2011) have been exceeded in Islington through introduction of congestion charging and traffic calming schemes.		SA3, E2, G2, G13	TR1, TD1, TD2
		Boroughs must also set out schemes and activities to reduce traffic growth.	Yes		The council intends to maintain these reductions in the face of significant population and employment increases in the borough in the years to come. A range of programmes will contribute towards keeping traffic volumes down, including the 'Traffic calming in residential areas' programme outlined in chapter 4 and appendix A.			
		Appropriate boroughs must not adopt policies nor implement projects that compromise the traffic reduction benefits achieved by the Central London CCS.	Yes	Controlled parking objectives and Traffic reduction policies work in favour of the Central London CCS. Further emphasis on reducing car parking in the borough would give more support to the Central London CCS.				
4G.Pr14	III	Congestion charging: Relevant boroughs must set out their plan to implement existing agreed schemes. If the central London Congestion Charging Zone is extended further guidance will be issued if appropriate.	Yes	All CTM schemes associated with the introduction of congestion charging in Islington have been completed.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. The council has delivered a number of complementary measures to the Central London congestion charging scheme and will continue to implement 20mph zones throughout Islington over the next ten years. See the 'Traffic calming in residential areas' programme outlined in chapter 4 and appendix A. Islington will work with TfL to deliver further complementary measures if the zone is extended.		SA3, E2, G2, G13	TR1, TD1, TD2
4G.Po5		Controlled parking zones: Boroughs are encouraged to include in their Parking and Enforcement Plans a programme for identification, review and implementation of potential new CPZs, including funding assumptions. Boroughs are encouraged to refer to 'Parking and Enforcement Guidance for Local Authorities' contained in Appendix E of LIP Guidance. It is noted that the introduction of CPZs is subject to public consultation.	Yes		No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. See the Controlled Parking Zones programme in chapter 4 and appendix A, as well as the Parking Policy Statement. Specifically, CPZs will be implemented throughout residential areas of the borough where residents are supportive.		E10	P1
4G.Pr15	IV	Supporting the TLRN: Boroughs must include in their Parking and Enforcement Plans a programme for reviewing and implementing parking and loading controls on 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes.	No	A specific programme for reviewing and implementing parking and loading controls on 'A' Roads and 'Busy Bus Routes' was not included.	Supported. The 'Islington Parking Policy Statement' (appendix E) has been expanded to include a section on the review of waiting and loading on borough principal roads (which covers both SRN roads and 'A Roads and Busy Bus Routes'). This is based on the proposals on 'Parallel initiatives' (PI1) and 'Controlled parking zone' (P1) in chapter 4, and their specific programmes set out in appendix A.	See appendices A and E, and chapter 4	E10, E11, AT6	PI1, P1

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		Boroughs must demonstrate how they have taken into account the needs of disabled motorists and the servicing and delivery needs of businesses.	Yes	A range of provisions are available. Although not referenced to 4G.Pr15, it is noted that the activities of the FQP will address servicing and delivery issues. Islington is also encouraged to consider the TfL advice note which details how to meet this requirement and draws on experience from the west London FQP.				
		Refer to 'Parking and Enforcement Guidance for Local Authorities' contained in Appendix E of this Guidance. The approach to reviewing parking and loading restrictions on 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes must be similar to that taken on the TLRN and help to facilitate the development of an approach as set out by MTS proposal 4G.Pr18.	No	The borough is to make clear approach to reviewing these roads.				
4G.Po6		Planning policies on parking: Boroughs are encouraged to demonstrate how they are using their planning policies to achieve this objective. (See also 4G.Pr16).	Yes		Supported. Islington's Parking Policy Statement , appendix E , has been developed to be consistent with the MTS and the London Plan. In addition, the council's UDP is currently consistent with these mayoral policies as discussed in the section above relating to 3.Po7 Planning policy, and when developed, the council's new LDF will also be consistent.	See section on 'Residential off-street parking' in appendix E	E10, E11	P1
		Boroughs must have regard to the Policy Standards (Annex 4 of the London Plan) in developing parking policies for their UDPs and in exercising their development control functions.	Yes	The LIP sets out policies that reflect the London Plan although there is no mention of Public Transport Accessibility Level's or implementation of 'maximum' parking standards.				
4G.Pr16	IV	Off-street car parks: Boroughs must set out a summary list of all off-street public car parks in town centres, together with the borough's charging policy.	N/A	Islington does not operate any off-street car parks	Supported. The Parking Policy Statement , appendix E , in the section relating to off-street parking, includes a list of off-street public car parks in Islington, including a map of off-street parking locations throughout the borough , and a consideration of pricing issues. All off-street car parks in the borough provide parking facilities for disabled customers.	See figure E.2 (Off-street parking) in appendix E	E10, E11	
		The off-street parking list must identify parking facilities for disabled customers.	N/A	Islington does not operate any off-street car parks				
		Boroughs must include a Parking and Enforcement plan in accordance with MTS requirements and 'Parking and Enforcement Guidance for Local Authorities' in Appendix E of this Guidance.	Yes	Parking and Enforcement plan included.				
4G.Pr17	IV	Parking and Enforcement Plans: Boroughs must include Parking and Enforcement Plans as an integral part of LIPs. Refer to 'Parking and Enforcement Guidance for Local Authorities' - Appendix E of this Guidance.	Yes	Parking and Enforcement plan included.	Supported. Appendix E contains the council's Parking Policy Statement .		E10, E11	

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4G.Pr18	III	Parallel initiatives: Boroughs must include a plan, including a timetable, for implementing parallel initiatives on all 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes (as shown on the map in Appendix D) under their control. Parallel initiatives must include the following elements: - Identification of sections of the 'A' Roads and Busy Bus routes network to review with TfL by July 2005 - Determination of the principal functions of the section of network in terms of the importance of the different road users based on the MTS with TfL by July 2005 - Assessment of the problems experienced on the section of network by road users taking account of the priorities for main roads identified above by December 2006 - Design and development of schemes to address the problems identified above by March 2011.	No	The LIP contains no reference to parallel initiatives nor any proposals for delivering these.	Supported. A new proposal (PI1) has been added covering 'Parallel Initiatives', including a programme to review each principal road and improve traffic management and parking arrangements by March 2011.	See proposal PI1 and annexes 1 and 2 in chapter 4, and programme in appendix A	E1, E10	HI1, B1
4G.Pr19	III	London Traffic Control Centre: Boroughs must set out specific proposals to support the provision of information to LTCC.	No	There is no mention of providing information to the LTCC.	Supported. Proposal HI3 outlines the process by which the council provides information to LTCC.	See proposal HI3	E2, E6	
4G.Pr20	III	Congestion bottlenecks: Boroughs must include a programme for a review of the worst congestion bottlenecks and an implementation programme for addressing these.	No	Congestion in the borough has been identified and mapped and the LIP includes details of future public transport initiatives to relieve this congestion. However no specific mention has been made regarding identifying the congestion spots and /or implementing any programmes to address these. Islington must provide a programme for hot-spot junctions.	Supported. A new proposal (PI1) has been added covering 'Parallel Initiatives'. Supporting information is provided in annexes 1 and 2, including identification of key congestion points.	See proposal PI1 and annexes 1 and 2 in chapter 4	E2, E6	
4G.Pr22		Signing: Boroughs are encouraged to set out a programme for addressing current deficiencies in secondary and local signing and street name signing.	Yes	Although no specific program, and only the LIP associated with Pedestrians addresses signage, the borough have demonstrated that they are implementing signage improvements at various locations / routes across the borough.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Proposal HI8 commits the council to an ongoing review of all street signing and street name signing.		SA6, AT3	HI9
4G.Pr23		Streetworks taskforce: Boroughs are encouraged to set out any relevant plans and activities.	No	There are no references to establishing a streetworks taskforce.	Proposal HI3 (Road and footway maintenance) within the final draft LIP includes detail on the current activities of the council's Streetworks team.	See the updated proposal in chapter 4	E3, E6	
4G.Pr24	III	Road and streetworks coordination: Boroughs must set out how their proposals meet their statutory duties and how they propose to develop mechanisms for coordination of road and streetworks.	No	There are no references to coordination of road and streetworks	Proposal HI3 (Road and footway maintenance) in the final draft LIP includes detail on how the council's Streetworks team coordinates streetworks in the borough.	See the updated proposal in chapter 4	E5, E6	HI3
4G.Pr25	VIII	Asset Management Plans: Boroughs must include programmes for preparing five year asset management plans.	No	The Final LIP needs to include a programme for preparing a five year asset management plan. However the borough has indicated to develop an asset management plan by March 2007.	Supported. A new 'Highway Asset Management Plan' proposal (HI5) has been included within chapter 4 of the final draft LIP setting out the council's current programme for preparing an asset management plan by March 2007.	See proposal HI5 in chapter 4	SA6, E5	HI5

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4G.Pr26	VIII	Street maintenance: Boroughs must refer to the Street Maintenance Strategy (published by TfL in June 2003) and Street Maintenance Plans in preparing their LIP.	No	No mention is made of this TfL strategy.	The final draft LIP refers to TfL's Street Maintenance Strategy and Plans within chapter 6 (Borough core capacity statement). In addition, proposal HI3 (Road and footway maintenance) in the final draft LIP provides details of the hours of operation for road works. Supported. Chapter 4 outlines the council's street maintenance plan. However, it is of utmost importance that TfL funding for street maintenance be increased, including for local roads.	See updates to chapter 6 and proposal HI3 in chapter 4	SA6, E4, E5, E6	HI1, HI2, HI3
		Boroughs are encouraged to include a statement of their policy regarding hours of operation of roadworks.	No	There is no statement of policy on the hours of operation of roadworks.				
4H.Pr1		Real-time traffic information: Boroughs are encouraged to implement schemes to provide real-time information on traffic conditions and parking and to complement TfL's initiatives in this area.	No	There was no mention of real time information on traffic conditions and parking.	Supported. The council currently provides extensive online information about road and streetworks, and the council will work with TfL to provide current information to motorists via the LTCC. The council have also commissioned a study into how real-time traffic and parking information could be collected and made available to the public, based on the actual movement of traffic using GPS tags. This data would be built into our traffic model (see proposal P11 'Parallel initiatives' and related programme in appendix A), and our highways information management system, Symology. If feasible, people would be able to use the Interactive Islington GIS web service to see any delays to their journey, beyond the road and streetworks that are already provided. Before making any additional information available, the council will examine the potential impacts of the availability of real-time information on traffic volumes, modal split and the overall objectives of this strategy.		E4, E6	HI9
4H.Pr2	IV	Park-and-ride: Boroughs must include an indication of any sites the borough considers suitable for park-and-ride, or any plans the borough has to conduct a review of potential sites in line with the criteria in 4H.Pr2. (This is particularly relevant for outer London boroughs.)	Yes	The LIP states that after review, there are no suitable locations for P&R sites within the borough.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Not applicable. There are no suitable locations for park-and-ride facilities in Islington. Islington Council intends to promote use of public transport for the entire journey rather than facilitating car commuting for part of the journey.		N/A	N/A
		Boroughs are encouraged to identify appropriate proposals for other car parking at stations.	Yes	The LIP identifies that after review there are no suitable locations for such sites within the borough.				
4H.Pr3	III	Car share and car clubs: Boroughs with such schemes and clubs must set out their programme for the further establishment and development of car share and car club schemes, where justified by local conditions. Other boroughs are encouraged to set out their plans for such schemes and clubs.	Yes	Islington is one of seven boroughs that form London City Car Club consortium.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Proposal TD3 (City Car Clubs) has been updated following a change of car club operator. Supported. The 'Car clubs' proposal in chapter 4 lays out the council's programme for expansion of car clubs in Islington. Both car clubs and car sharing will be promoted as part of the council's 'Travel awareness education and events' proposal in chapter 4.	See the revised proposal in chapter 4.	G1, G2, G13	TD2, TD3
4I.Pr2	VI	Pedestrian infrastructure improvements: Boroughs must include programmes and plans for infrastructure improvements and promotional activities to deliver better conditions for pedestrians.	Yes	Pedestrians are the borough's main priorities and a range of programmes are proposed for improvements.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. A comprehensive proposal to improve the safety of people travelling at night (SN1 – Safer travel at night) has been included in chapter 4 of the final draft LIP. Supported. The strategy's key objectives include making the borough safer, more accessible and more secure, and a range of proposals will contribute towards improved pedestrian environments.	See the new proposal in chapter 4.	SA1, SA6, AC4, AC6, G9, G10, E5, SE1-3, AT1-3	AS1-4, W1-3, TD2, TX1, SN1
		Boroughs must also include proposals for improving personal safety and security, especially for women and vulnerable groups, particularly at night.	No	There is a need for the borough to set out is more comprehensive programme for improving safety at night beyond taxis.				
4I.Pr3	VI	Walking Plan for London: Boroughs must include information on how they will	Yes	The borough has developed a walking strategy to contribute towards the effective implementation of	No significant changes from the consultation draft.		SA1, SA6, SA7, AC4,	AS1-6, W1-3, TD2,

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		contribute towards the effective implementation of the Walking Plan.		the Walking Plan for London.	Supported. The strategy is consistent with and supportive of the Walking Plan for London, and a range of proposals will contribute towards increased walking in Islington.		AC6, G10, G13, E6, SE1-3, AT2	TX1
4I.Pr4	VI	World Squares: The City of Westminster must set out how scheme management will be continued in Trafalgar Square and developed, when appropriate, for Parliament Square. Boroughs must describe the management principles relating to the operation of other pedestrianised area projects that are being developed, where appropriate.	No	The Final LIP must describe the management principles relating to the operation of pedestrianised area projects that are being developed, where appropriate, or state the reasons why they are not appropriate.	Supported. Individual proposals have been created within the 'Area-based schemes' section in chapter 4 of the final draft LIP, covering Regeneration schemes, Town centres, 'Streets for People' schemes and Station access. All of these schemes could potentially include pedestrianisation, and these would be designed and managed based on the council's Streetbook and the specific characteristics of the area. While Islington has no sites that have been identified as 'World Squares', Highbury Corner has been identified as part of the Mayor of London's '100 public spaces' programme as discussed under proposal AB3, 'Streets for People' schemes.	See the new proposals in chapter 4	AC6, G10	AB1-4
4I.Pr6	VI	Strategic walking routes: Boroughs must include programmes and schemes to improve existing strategic routes. Boroughs must protect these routes through their planning documents. Local promotion of routes must consider the communication requirements of local residents.	Yes	The borough will continue to develop a system of walking routes, including three main routes. The council will design, consult on, and implement improvements. There is no comment on the protection of routes in the LIP, and the final LIP would benefit from this.	Proposal W1 (Walking routes and network) now includes a statement clarifying that pedestrian access (including walking routes) will be protected by the council's planning policy, including UDP policy T45. Supported. While no Greater London strategic walking routes pass through Islington, the council will work to improve its own strategic routes as stated in proposal W2.	See proposal W1 in chapter 4	G10	W1
4I.Pr7	VI	Pedestrian phases: Boroughs must set out the priorities and programme(s) for the investigation and introduction of pedestrian phases.	Yes	The borough will undertake walking audits to identify programmes of remedial works for all major council traffic schemes.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Islington Council has a programme for introducing pedestrian phases at all the signalised junctions in the borough. Where necessary, priority signals for buses will be considered. The council is also exploring the feasibility of diagonal and scramble crossings to further increase safety and convenience for pedestrians.		SA1, G10	AS2
		Mitigation measures to minimise significant adverse impacts on buses must also be taken into account. The programme must take account of any impacts on all the targets in Table 4-1.	Yes	Supported with pedestrian phases and mitigation measures for buses.				
4I.Pr8	VI	Footway improvements and bus stop accessibility: Boroughs must set out their programmes of footway improvements, including access improvements and accessibility improvements to bus stops.	Yes	Comprehensive measures to improve footways across the borough. The borough will continue to undertake footway improvements, especially in the key priority areas. Walking audits will be undertaken to identify where priority should be given.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Proposals HI1 to HI3 cover footway conditions and maintenance, which will be carried out holistically alongside general the highways infrastructure improvement programme. Proposal B2 outlines the council's bus stop accessibility programme.		SA1, AC4, G9-10, E6, AT2-3, AT6	HI1-3, B2
		Boroughs must consult on local pedestrian priorities when preparing programme of access improvements.	Yes	Borough consultation with mobility impaired persons is to take place. The borough will consult when preparing a programmes.				
4J.Po1		Safer cycling: Boroughs are encouraged to set out how they consult with cyclist user groups and undertake and support measures to make the cycling environment safer and more convenient.	No	Please detail frequency of meetings and communication methods within the Final LIP.	The 'Sustainable Transport Strategy proposals to increase cycling' section of the Cycling Action Plan in the final draft LIP has been expanded with details of how the council successfully engages with local cyclists. Supported. The strategy's key objectives include making the borough safer, more accessible and more secure, and a range of proposals will contribute towards improved conditions for cyclists, as outlined in the Islington Cycling Action Plan (appendix G). The Islington Cyclists Action Group (ICAG) is consulted on all council transport schemes and is being consulted on	See the updated section in appendix G	SA1, G10, G12, SE1, AT7	C1-6, TR1, TD1-2

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
					this strategy.			
4J.Pr1	VII	LCAP: Boroughs must include details of local borough action to support London Cycling Action Plan objectives.	No	(4.1) Please include details of borough action (4.3, 5.1) Please refer to London developments in cycle powered delivery and TfL's public information e.g. London Cycle Guides. (9.4) Refer to and append cycle parking standards.	<p>Proposal C2 has been expanded with reference to the local cycle network using green spaces and corridors (4.1). Proposal C4 has been expanded with the council's cycle parking standards for new developments (9.4), TD1 has been expanded to include mention of the potential for cycle-powered delivery, and TD2 has been expanded to make mention of the council distributing cycle information such as the London Cycle Guides and the introduction of licensed pedicabs (4.3 and 5.1).</p> <p>Supported. Islington's STS is consistent with and supportive of the LCAP, and a range of proposals will contribute towards increased walking in Islington, as outlined in the Islington Cycling Action Plan (appendix G).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>LCAP Objective 1 – Introduce quality conditions on the London Cycle Network Plus:</i> Proposal C2 outlines the council's programme to deliver the Islington sections of LCN+, as well as other local cycle routes. • <i>LCAP Objective 2 – Increase cycle safety, access and priority:</i> Proposal C2 focuses on this objective, but other proposals such as 20 mph zones (TR1) and Safer Routes to School (SR1) will also contribute. • <i>LCAP Objective 3 – Increase cycle parking provision:</i> Proposal C4 focuses on this objective. • <i>LCAP Objective 4 – Support innovative cycling schemes:</i> The council supports innovative cycle schemes where practical. A recent example is the introduction of secure cycle parking facilities at the Finsbury Park interchange. • <i>LCAP Objective 5 – Promote cycling and improve its status:</i> Policy E1 places cyclists near the top of the council's road user hierarchy, and cycling will be promoted not only through facility improvements but also through travel awareness and behaviour change (proposals TD1 and TD2). • <i>LCAP Objective 6 – Incentives and support for target groups:</i> The council's travel demand management programme targets groups most likely to increase cycling, and the Safer Routes to School and school travel plan programmes outline how school children will be encouraged and assisted to cycle more, including through cycle training • <i>LCAP Objective 7 - Increase mutual awareness and respect between cyclists, pedestrians and other road users:</i> In addition to the travel demand management programme, proposal C3 outlines the council's plan to cycle audit all major transport schemes. The audit process will take into account the attitudes and behaviour of different road user groups. • <i>LCAP Objective 8 - Promote cycle links and interchange schemes:</i> Proposals C2 and C4 relate to improved cycle links and parking, and the travel demand management programme (W3, C5 and TD1-3) will continue to promote existing and new facilities. • <i>LCAP Objective 9 - Optimise the contribution to cycling from other schemes:</i> Proposal C3 on cycle audits will help ensure that all transport schemes improve conditions for cyclists. • <i>LCAP Objective 10 - Improve coordination and partnership:</i> The council will continue to work with Transport for London, local cyclists and other partners and stakeholders to increase cycling in Islington. 	See proposals C2, C4, TD1 and TD2 in chapter 4	AC6, G11, G13	C2, C4, TD2
4J.Pr3	VII	LCN: Relevant boroughs must set out implementation programmes for the LCN.	N/A	LCN has been superseded by LCN+ - see 4J.Pr4 below. LCN+ budget is available for LCN+ schemes and other cycling network schemes should be funded by Non-LCN+ budget.	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft.</p> <p>Supported. Proposal C2 outlines the council's programme to deliver the Islington sections of LCN and LCN+, as well as other local cycle routes.</p>		G11	C2
4J.Pr4	VII	LCN+: Relevant boroughs must set out in their implementation programmes for	Yes	Please clarify number of links in budgeted programme within the Final LIP	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft. Appendix A includes a full programme of links to be improved during the first three years of strategy implementation.</p>	See appendix A	G11	C2

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		LCN+.			Supported. Proposal C2 and appendix A set out the council's programme to deliver the Islington sections of LCN and LCN+, as well as other local cycle routes.			
4J.Pr5	VII	Cyclist accident locations: Boroughs must include a programme for review of key cyclist accident locations and a programme for the implementation of traffic management solutions. On 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes (see Map in Appendix D) this must be incorporated into the 'parallel initiatives' as set out by 4G.Pr18.	No Yes	Please include programme details within the Final LIP. The LIP identifies Islington's commitment to carry out cycling audits for all major council traffic schemes.	Proposal LS1 (Local safety schemes) in the final draft LIP indicates that the council will investigate accident patterns in the borough and will implement local safety schemes to reduce the number of accidents in 'hot spots'. Specific proposed schemes will be listed in annual LIP Reporting and Funding submissions. This intent is reflected within appendix A. Supported. Cyclist accident locations will be reviewed and addressed as part of the council's local safety scheme programme (proposal LS1), and Cycle audits (proposal C3) would be carried out on all works including those affecting 'A roads and busy bus routes'.	See the updated detail in appendix 4	SA1, G11, E1-2	LS1, C3
4J.Pr6	VII	Cycle audits: Boroughs must include details of their cycle audit procedures.	No	Please include details of the audit procedures within the Final LIP.	The Cycle audits proposal (C3) in the final draft LIP has been expanded to include details of the issues that would be considered in a cycle audit. Supported. Proposal C3 outlines the council's current cycle audit procedures. However, these are currently under review, and further detail will be included in the final draft STS.	See the updated proposal in chapter 4	SA1, G11	C3
4J.Pr7	VII	Cycle access and parking: Boroughs must include details of programme proposals for additional cycle access and secure cycle parking facilities.	No	(3.1) Please include programme details for on-street parking, including town centre locations. (8.1) Please Include programme details for parking at stations (3.5) include details of borough action to encourage, facilitate cycle parking at home. (3.2) Refer to borough's participation in Mayor's School Cycle Parking Programme.	Please refer to the new Area-based schemes proposals covering Regeneration schemes (AB1), Town centres (AB2), 'Streets for People' schemes (AB3) and Station access (AB4), and the Cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities proposal (C4) in chapter 4 of the final draft LIP. Supported. See proposals C2, C4 and C5. In addition, the council's travel plan promotion programme (proposal TD1) will encourage and where possible require local businesses and developers to provide secure cycle parking for employees, residents and the public.	See proposals AB1-4 and C4 in chapter 4	AC6, G11, SE4	C2, C4-5, TD1
4J.Pr8	VII	Cycle training: Boroughs must include details of programmes for the implementation of these measures.	No	(6.1) Please include programme details within the Final LIP. (7.3) Demonstrate how cycling is incorporated into enforcement programmes.	The final draft LIP contains a new Cycle training proposal (C6) setting out the council's programme for cycle training at the three different levels specified in the National Standard. Appendix A includes a related programme. Proposals RS1 (Road safety education and training) and RS2 (Road safety enforcement) set out additional measures the council will undertake to raise awareness of safe cycling techniques and to improve enforcement of cycling and driving behaviour.	See proposals C6 and RS1-2 in chapter 4, and appendix A	SA1, SA5, SA7, G11, G13	C6, RS1, RS2
4K.Pr1		London Sustainable Distribution Partnership: Boroughs are encouraged to include a commitment to work with TfL to achieve the aims of the LSDP and help further specific initiatives identified by the LSDP, for example facilitating trials and providing information from surveys.	Yes		No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. The council is committed to sustainable freight movement and will work with TfL, neighbouring boroughs and other partners to address freight issues in and around Islington.		SA1, E13	F1, F2
4K.Pr2		Freight Quality Partnerships: Boroughs are encouraged to set out the strategies and schemes to be adopted to achieve the LSDP freight related objectives including participating in sub-regional partnerships as appropriate and implementation of activities and schemes (see 4K.Pr1).	Yes		The final draft LIP maintains the Freight Quality Partnership proposal (F2) with partners and specific issues being identified as part of this process. A new proposal has been developed to implement measures that come out of the partnership work and consultation carried out with the FQP (F3 – Freight Priority Initiatives). The council has provided its interim 'Freight Contacts Map' to TfL separately from the LIP, as the details are likely to change frequently during the ten years covered by the STS.	See proposals F2 and F3 in chapter 4	SA1, E13	F2, F3

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		Boroughs are encouraged to identify freight forum representatives and a freight contacts map covering freight related activities including waste planning, development planning, fleet vehicle manager (goods vehicles), environmental health officer (delivery noise abatement).	No	Islington is encouraged to include an interim freight contacts map as part of their final submission, on the understanding that this will change after introduction of the FQP.				
4K.Pr3	III	Lorry bans: Boroughs must include a commitment to engage with the LLCS consultation process, a commitment to seek ways to work with the ALG to modernise, where appropriate, the requirements of the LLCS in respect of vehicle specifications, routing requirements and driver training, or equivalent measures in response to the proposal.	Yes		No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Proposal F1 outlines the council's lorry ban programme. The council is particularly keen to help develop and pilot more effective enforcement methods.		SA1, E13	F1
4K.Pr4		Environmental impacts of freight: Boroughs must set out how they are progressing LEZ proposals, in particular their commitment to the London-wide scheme.	Yes		No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. The council believes that an LEZ for London would be beneficial to the borough, and is working with the ALG, the GLA and other London boroughs to arrive at a joint decision on whether to implement a London LEZ. The council is actively encouraging uptake of cleaner-fuel vehicles as part of its travel plan promotion programme (proposal TD1) and its travel awareness programme (proposal TD2). The council is currently implementing its own Green Travel Plan, which includes a significant Greening the Fleet component. See entry at 3.Pr6 regarding transport of waste by rail, river or canal.		G4, G5	TD1-2, EN1
		Boroughs must identify potential facilities for alternative cleaner fuels and the strategy to be followed in their increased provision and use.	Yes	The opening of an LPG refuelling facility at Lough Road is welcomed. Also welcomed is the decision of the council to investigate the provision of electric vehicle charging point. The Final LIP might also consider referring to a map (which could be in another document if available) identifying where current facilities are in the borough e.g. garage forecourts and depots with alt. fuels, and the potential could be identified as being those without as yet.				
		Boroughs must identify how the uptake of cleaner fueled vehicles is to be encouraged and improved vehicle maintenance standards supported. Boroughs must identify a strategy for uptake of cleaner fueled vehicles within the borough's own transport fleet and the freight fleets of contracted services.	Yes	Islington state in their AQAP that they will encourage other organisations to implement a programme of vehicle replacement that maximises alternative fuels and reduces harmful emissions. Whilst this is welcomed, the borough should be requiring contracted services to adopt greener technologies and not merely encouraging them as suggested in their AQAP.				
		Boroughs must also identify measures to encourage waste transport by rail, river and canal where appropriate (whilst promoting safe use of the River Thames), and taking account of environmental impacts.	Yes	Islington notes the difficulties in developing waste to rail and water in the borough due to lack of facilities and difficulties in creating new facilities.				
4K.Pr5		Rail freight: Boroughs are encouraged to set out measures to protect potential new and existing rail freight transfer locations.	Yes	This is supported by the borough though the potential is limited.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported, though potential is limited in Islington. See entry at 4E.Pr8.		E4, E13	F2

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4L.Po6		Airport transport: Boroughs which are members of the Airport Transport Forums are encouraged to include a commitment to work within these bodies to achieve a significant increase in the proportion of travel to airports by public transport, and to limit traffic congestion in the vicinity of the airport in conjunction with TfL.	N/A	Islington state that being a member of the Airports Forum is not applicable to them.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Not applicable. However, Islington Council is keen to improve public transport access from Islington to London's airports, as outlined in proposal RU3.		G12	RU3
		Relevant boroughs are encouraged to include appropriate initiatives.	N/A					
4M.Pr2		Freight and waterways: Relevant boroughs are encouraged to set out any measures they are implementing on relevant issues e.g. safeguarding wharves and facilities, access to river.	N/A	Regent's Canal, Islington's only canal, is not considered suitable for freight movement.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Not applicable. Regent's Canal, Islington's only waterway, is not suitable for freight movement.		G8	WT1
4MPo2		Freight and waterways: Relevant boroughs must take account of decisions relating to safeguarding of wharves in developing relevant plans and programmes.	N/A	Regent's Canal, Islington's only canal, is not considered suitable for freight movement.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Not applicable. Regent's Canal, Islington's only waterway, is not suitable for freight movement.		G8	WT1
4N.Po2		Safe community transport services: Boroughs are encouraged to confirm that when reviewing contracts which entail the carrying of vulnerable passengers (e.g. schoolchildren, older people), they ensure that contracting bodies take steps to ensure that drivers are checked at the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB).	Yes	The borough is encouraged to set out the framework in place to ensure that such drivers are CRB checked.	The final draft LIP maintains the community transport services proposal (AS4), which has been expanded to provide greater detail on the monitoring of drivers used. Supported. All providers of council transport services carry out police checks of staff.	See updated proposal in chapter 4	AC1, AC3, SE1	AS4
		Boroughs are encouraged to identify mechanisms for the ongoing monitoring of PHV operators and drivers used.	No	No reference to ongoing monitoring could be found within the LIP.				
4N.Pr1		Taxi waiting areas and safer travel at night: Boroughs are encouraged to include proposals in line with the PCO best practice guidelines, to include: - new provision, especially at key sites of new and improved taxi ranks, for example at railways / bus stations and in town centres, and- identification of key points of contact.	No	Discussion of taxi waiting areas for Safer Travel at Night is welcome, but consideration of interchanges is missing and no mention of PCO guidelines is made.	Proposal TX2 (Taxi ranks and access points) has been expanded to provide greater detail on taxi access points in addition to taxi ranks. Two new proposals have also been included in the final draft LIP, one on improving transport interchanges in partnership with TfL (RU2 – transport interchange improvements), and the other on Safer travel at night (SN1).	See proposals TX2, RU2 and SN1 in chapter 4	AC3, SE1, SE3	AS4, RU2, TX1-2, SN1
		Boroughs are encouraged to promote the Mayor's 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives and include their own proposals for improving safety and security including for woman and vulnerable groups.	No	Islington clearly supports the Mayor's STAN initiative but no specific STAN schemes are contained in the LIP. There are, nevertheless, some interesting ideas to pursue in the Final LIP.				

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4N.Pr5	V	Community transport: Boroughs must include details of how they will work with TfL and the CT sector to take forward these objectives.	No	The Final LIP must include further details on future joint working with TfL and the CT sector.	The final draft LIP includes a proposal on community transport services that are provided within the borough (AS4), which has been expanded to clarify partnerships and arrangements for working with other organisations.	See proposals AS4 and AS8 in chapter 4	AC3	AS4
		Boroughs must demonstrate how consideration is given to Taxi and other door-to-door services carrying out subsidised journeys for disabled people in terms of the need for the vehicle to stop at an accessible point for the passenger and for the driver to offer assistance in entering and exiting the vehicle.	No	The borough is currently reviewing community and accessible services and is also awaiting outcome of TfL's D2D strategy. The borough is to include details in the Final LIP.				
		Boroughs must take account of the outcomes of the CAT pilots including ensuring efficient and appropriate use of local CT schemes within a coherent service delivery framework.	N/A	The borough is still awaiting the outcome of the D2D review by TfL to inform its approach.				
4O.Po1		Accessible transport: Boroughs are encouraged to set out measures they are taking to make their transport system more accessible and to identify benchmark accessibility standards for measuring outputs with performance targets for outcomes.	Yes	Range of measures being taken consistent with establishing accessibility standards for measuring outputs. Islington has a strong commitment to improve accessibility across the borough through its Walking and Accessibility Action Plan.	Contained within the final draft LIP the Islington Walking and Accessibility Action Plan provides a comprehensive outline of council initiatives to make Islington's transport environment more accessible. Specifically, the required LIP targets have been included in STS chapter 7, the council has established a mobility forum (proposal AS1), accessible transport services are being delivered and reviewed to improve service provision (proposal AS4 and AS5), and funding for Scootability and Shopmobility services are sought (proposal AS5).	See proposals AS4-6 and AS8 in chapter 4	AC3-4	AS1, AS4-6
		Boroughs are encouraged to identify strategy and mechanisms for consulting with older and disabled people, including identifying local stakeholder groups.	Yes	A mobility forum has been established as a consultative mechanism with disabled and older people.				
		Boroughs are encouraged to include proposals to promote or introduce Shopmobility schemes and proposals to improve direction signing of accessible routes to assist mobility impaired people, especially in town centres and at tourist and other attractions.	No	Shopmobility scheme identified and support being sought. It is noted that the Wayfinding project will contribute to the improved direction signing, but the Final LIP should make it clear that this will cover accessible routes to town centres and other major trip attractors.				
4O.Pr1	V	Eligibility for services: Boroughs must set out how they will deliver door-to-door transport services for disabled people. Refer also to Proposal 4O.Pr3.	No	The borough is reliant upon further information from TfL with reference to the Door 2 Door Strategy. The borough will be able to address this item within the next annual progress update.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. See entry at 4O.Po1.		AC3	AS1, AS3-5
4O.Po2		Eligibility for services: Boroughs are encouraged to set out how they will implement door-to-door transport services for disabled people (including the adoption of fair standard all-London eligibility and entitlement criteria).	No	Further information from the TfL Door 2 Door strategy will assist the borough to inform further actions. The borough will be able to address this item within the next annual progress update. No commitment to London-wide criteria is made in the LIP.	Future changes to door-to-door transport services provided by the council will be informed by the outcomes of TfL's forthcoming Door-to-Door strategy. However, the final draft LIP includes more information on Taxicards (proposal AS4) setting out how the council delivers the Taxicard scheme for eligible residents of the borough, in partnership with the ALG. Supported. See entry at 4O.Po1.	See new proposal in chapter 4	AC3	AS1, AS4, AS5

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4O.Pr3	V	Taxicard scheme: Boroughs must set how they will deliver door-to-door transport services for disabled people ensuring a consistent minimum London-wide standard. Refer also to Proposal 4O.Pr1.	No	The borough is reliant upon further information from TfL with reference to the Door 2 Door Strategy. The borough will be able to address this item within the next annual progress update. No commitment given to a minimum London-wide standard.	Supported. The delivery of the Taxicard scheme (Proposal AS4) is included in chapter 4 and its performance measures are included in chapter 7 of the final draft LIP.	See new proposal in chapter 4 and performance indicators in chapter 7.	AC3	AS4
4O.Pr4	V	Licensed private-hire vehicles: Boroughs must indicate how their proposals for door-to-door transport will integrate licensed PHVs into appropriate service delivery mechanisms.	No	The borough is reliant upon further information from TfL with reference to the Door 2 Door Strategy. The borough will be able to address this item within the next annual progress update.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. Council community transport services and any services established or promoted through 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives will be appropriately licensed.		AC3, SE3	AS4-6, TX1, SN1
4O.Pr5	V	Commission for Accessible Transport pilots: Boroughs must set out how they will deliver door-to-door transport services taking account of CAT results as appropriate.	No	The borough is reliant upon further information from TfL with reference to CAT pilots.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. When made available, the results of the CAT pilot projects will be incorporated into the council's review of its community transport services (proposal AS4).		AC3	AS4-6
4O.Pr6	V	Review of door-to-door transport: Boroughs must set out how they will deliver door-to-door transport services for disabled people taking account of CAT results as appropriate.	No	The borough is reliant upon further information from TfL with reference to the Door 2 Door Strategy and the CAT pilots.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. When made available, TfL's Strategic Review of Door-to-Door Transport and the results of the CAT pilot projects will be incorporated into the council's review of its community transport services (proposal AS4).		AC3	AS3, AS4
4O.Pr9	V	Mobility consultation: Boroughs must indicate how they will maintain, establish and facilitate local mobility consultation mechanisms ensuring that disabled people are fully represented and how such mechanisms will contribute to local policy development around accessible transport.	No	The Mobility Forum has been established. However, the borough should clarify the role of the Forum in policy development relating to accessible transport. Additional details in the Final LIP on user group representation would be welcome.	The final draft LIP maintains a proposal on Islington's mobility forum (AS1) and has been expanded to include detail on its members and how the forum will contribute to the development of local accessible transport policy. Supported. See entry at 3.Pr1.	See updated proposal in chapter 4	AC2	AS1
		Boroughs must also indicate how local consultation processes can contribute to a London-wide strategic mobility forum.	No	The borough should identify how local mechanisms can contribute to the London-wide strategic mobility forum. TfL welcomes the borough's initiative to establish an independently-chaired mobility forum. However, no specific reference to borough representation at a London-wide mobility forum was found within the LIP.				
4O.Pr12	V	Powered wheelchair provision: Boroughs must include details of how they will assist the increased provision of powered wheelchairs and other mobility aids.	Yes	Scotability scheme has been developed and Shopmobility schemes are proposed. Strong commitment to Scotability (electric mobility scooter loan scheme) and Shopmobility.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Proposal AS5 (Scotability and Shopmobility) within the final draft LIP outlines the council's Scotability scooter loan scheme, as well as the council's intention to seek funding for a Shopmobility service in Islington.		AC3-4	AS5

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4O.Pr13	V	Disabled parking: Boroughs must include plans for providing sufficient disabled parking at key locations.	No	The borough should clarify plans for providing sufficient disabled parking including the criteria adopted to determine adequacy of provision. The Final LIP would benefit from a specific commitment to providing disabled parking bays at other additional key locations, e.g. shopping centres, hospitals.	Supported. The final draft LIP includes details of the provision of on-street disabled parking spaces in the section on 'The Blue Badge scheme' in the Parking Policy Statement (appendix E). In addition, the Area-based schemes (AB1-4) and 'Parallel initiatives' (PI1) proposals will all have improved accessibility as a key aim, including potentially reviewing parking provision.	See proposals AB1-4 and PI1 in chapter 4, and appendix E	AC4	P1, AB1-4
		Boroughs must seek views of local disabled motorists to determine potential key locations.	Yes	The borough has stated that such consultation will take place. The Final LIP would benefit from clarification as to how the views of local disabled motorists will be taken into account in determining potential key locations, and should make reference to specifically seeking views of disabled motorists on potential location of key parking bays. The recently establish local mobility forum would be a prime mechanism for consulting on this issue.				
4O.Pr14	V	Blue Badge scheme: Boroughs must set out a programme which contributes to a robust and reputable Blue Badge scheme.	No	Please confirm plans to act upon the recommendations following the review of experience in neighbouring boroughs.	Supported. The final draft LIP includes details of the provision of the Blue Badge scheme within the borough in the Parking Policy Statement (appendix E), and as a consideration within improving parking arrangements on the borough's principal roads (proposal PI1 – Parallel initiatives).	See new proposal in chapter 4 and appendix E	AC4	PI1, P1
4P.Po2		Interchanges and direction signage: Boroughs are encouraged to include a commitment to work with TfL and other partners to improve interchange and access, where appropriate by supporting TfL's Interchange Plan and according to the TfL Interchange Best Practice Guide and good practice accessibility guidelines (such as: Inclusive Mobility, SRA Code of Practice - Train and Station Services for Disabled Passengers, BS 8300 Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people – Code of practice (2001), Revised Part M of Building Regulations) including incorporation and improvement of facilities for taxis, cycling and walking and PHV and mobility impaired users.	Yes	The LIP contains a strong commitment to improving interchange and access across the region.	Proposal RU2 on 'Transport interchange improvements' has been added to the final draft LIP, and new information has been added to proposal AS4 on improving council services and accessibility information. See entry at 4O.Po1.	See proposals RU2 and AS8 in chapter 4	G10, G12, AT3	HI4, HI8, W4, RU2, AS4
		Boroughs are encouraged to provide details of how they will improve direction signing for accessible routes to assist mobility impaired people, especially in town centres and at tourist and other attractions.	No	It is noted that the Wayfinding project will contribute to the improved direction signing, but the Final LIP should make it clear that this will cover accessible routes to town centres and other major trip attractors.	Supported. Islington is working with TfL's Interchanges team to improve the connectivity between the London Underground, NLL and Thameslink stations. We are particularly focusing on improvements to Finsbury Park, Highbury & Islington and Archway stations. In addition, wayfinding boards are also being provided in high pedestrian volume areas to assist people in finding their destinations (proposal HI9). These have been designed in consultation with mobility-impaired people.			

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
4P.Pr3		Journey planner: Boroughs are encouraged to include proposals on how they will add to and improve TfL's Journey Planner facility e.g. specifying location of walking and cycling routes etc.	Yes	The LIP indicates that the borough regularly updates information about key destinations in Islington.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Supported. The council regularly updates information about key destinations in Islington for the journey planner.		G12	
4P.Pr4	III	Travel awareness: Borough's must set out programmes to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport and set out how relevant promotional work, (e.g. travel plans, travel awareness, demand management etc.) is being progressed and how these meet the communication requirements of local residents. <i>- Workplace travel plans: The London boroughs will develop a programme to provide travel advice in partnership with TfL. Employers will be encouraged to establish travel plans, to inform employees of the options available, and address issues such as parking provision, location decisions, and lack of facilities for cyclists. Such plans should be an integral part of development applications (see Policy3.Po7).</i> <i>- School Travel Plans: The London boroughs will work with schools to develop Plans that encourage more sustainable forms of Travel and reduce traffic congestion at schools.</i> <i>- Exploring marketing and ticketing opportunities to encourage The use of public transport for visits to major cultural and leisure events.</i> <i>- Campaigns to encourage responsible car use and driving techniques.</i>	Yes	TA Education and Events Campaigns will continue into the foreseeable future and will include: ongoing publicity campaign, regular annual events (Bike Week, European Car Free Day, Mobility Week, GG Week, W2S Week), production of practical resources and guidance, creative arts competitions and commissions, campaigns to promote walking and cycling, working in partnership with partners and stakeholders and working with the health sector to promote active lifestyles. The main areas of concerns are listed, and the borough has identified transport-related crime as a priority area. However, the borough is still to develop a planned programme to address the issues.	No significant changes from the consultation draft. Refer to the Travel Awareness (TD1 – travel plan promotion and TD2 – Travel awareness education and events) and School Travel Plan (ST1) proposals within the final draft LIP. Supported. The council actively promotes development and adoption of travel plans (proposal TD1), and delivers a travel awareness programme to promote more sustainable travel (proposal TD2).		G13	TD1-2, ST1
4P.Pr5	V	Transport-related crime: Boroughs must set out their programme(s) to reduce transport related crime and the fear of crime. Boroughs must also state how this activity and its outcomes will be monitored.	No	There is a lack of specific proposals relating to transport related crime either in the LIP or Crime Disorder and Drugs Misuse Strategy. Monitoring arrangements should also be stated.	The final draft LIP contains a range of proposals that contribute to reducing the potential for transport-related crimes in Islington. This extends to actively pursuing measures such as making night-time travel in Islington safer, especially for vulnerable groups (Proposal SN1 – Safer travel at night), introducing secure parking for motorcycles and scooters to help reduce theft (Proposal MS1 – Motorcycle and scooter parking), improving the personal safety of mini-	See new proposals in Chapter 4	SE1, SE3	C4, B3, RU2, TX1, TX2, MS1, SN1

MTS Ref	MTS Priority	Borough response (TfL Guidance)	Must or Encouraged included	Observation (TfL)	Borough response/comments (LBI)	Cross-reference to changes in final draft LIP	LBI Policy Reference	LBI Proposal Reference
		Boroughs also encouraged to promote the Mayor's 'Safer at Night' initiatives particularly in terms of personal safety in getting to and from rail stations, bus stations and bus stops.	No	Intent is stated however the borough is still to develop specific programmes.	<p>cab passengers (Proposal TX1 – Mini-cab safety), and installing improved cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities (Proposal C4 – Cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities).</p> <p>The final draft LIP contains a specific proposal for measures to make night-time travel in Islington safer, especially for vulnerable groups (SN1 – Safer travel at night).</p> <p>Supported. See entry at 4C.Pr12, Underground security issues. Specifically, the council will implement its Crime, Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy 2005-2007, which will address transport-related crime, and will pursue a range of 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives as part of the STS. These activities will be reported and monitored as part of the overall annual monitoring of the STS.</p>			
4Q.Po1		Increasing capacity: Boroughs are encouraged to set out local proposals to support increased public transport capacity.	Yes	The various proposed transport schemes are referred to in the document, and how their implementation will increase transport capacity, such as Thameslink 2000, Crossrail, and East London Line Extension.	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft.</p> <p>Supported. Islington Council is not leading on any specific major project proposals, but supports a number of major projects led by Transport for London and other council partners, as outlined in chapter 2 (Local transport context) and 9 (Regeneration and major transport projects)</p>		G12, E9	B1-3, RU1-3
4Q.Pr7		Specific tram proposals: Relevant boroughs are encouraged to take account of the West London Tram and East and London and Greenwich Waterfront transit proposals and identify how they will continue to engage with and provide support for the ongoing investigations and studies into the feasibility of the Cross River Tram project, being undertaken by TfL.	Yes	Islington is particularly supportive of the Cross River Tram and emphasises its importance north of Kings Cross into Islington. The benefits of the scheme are outlined which include increasing accessibility to jobs and services for the population.	<p>No significant changes from the consultation draft.</p> <p>Supported. Islington Council particularly supports the Cross River Tram proposal, but emphasises the importance of this tram being built to prepare for future potential extension of the tram from King's Cross into Islington, as discussed in chapter 9 (Regeneration and major transport projects).</p>		G12, E9	RU2-3